1	control a substance which is legal. Thank you.
2	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: Mr. Downin?
3	MR. RICHARD DOWNIN: Yes?
4	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: What clubs are we
5	talking about here?
6	MR. RICHARD DOWNIN: It's a variety from your
7	legions to your VFW's, to just private clubs of, like
8	your Elks, Moose, that sort of thing.
9	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: And are some of these
10	active in local civic activities?
11	MR. RICHARD DOWNIN: Oh, my
12	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: Like the Rotary?
13	MR. RICHARD DOWNIN: No, no, we're just
14	talking business type clubs.
15	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: Business type clubs, but
16	they might be active in the Washington County
17	MR. RICHARD DOWNIN: Active in the community.
18	In the community, yes.
19	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: In Washington County
20	Community. Thank you.
21	MS. CAROLYN WEST: Kim Lawson.

1 MS. KIM LAWSON: Hello, how are you. 2 COMMISSIONER KOELLEIN: We're fine, how are 3 you. MS. KIM LAWSON: Wonderful. I'll make this 5 very brief, it's getting very late and I'm sure you 6 guys are very tired. 7 MS. ELAINE PATRICK: Just warming up. 8 MS. KIM LAWSON: No, I will make it brief, I won't stay any longer than is necessary. My name is 10 Kim Lawson, I own Fishpaw Liquors down in Anne Arundel County, I'm also actively on the board of Anne Arundel 11 12 County Licensed Beverage Association. I'm here today as a business owner and I'm not a doctor, I'm not a 13 lawyer, I'm not a researcher, I don't have studies, I 14 don't have slides, I'm just here expressing some 15 concerns of, of the members of our association. 16 17 One of the things that is most upsetting 18 about this smoking ban is the continued government regulation that's being imposed upon our industry, 19 20 other industries and private individuals. It just 21 seems like over and over again we as business people

are constantly fighting against government; we don't understand why we can't work hand in hand in trying to solve some of these problems maybe not so restrictively. We feel that many of our members, restaurants and the bars, are trying to do the best that they can to adapt to concerns of non-smokers; I myself am a non-smoker, I'll let you know that ahead of time so I'm not swayed in any way by being a smoker.

And the other issue is definitely an economic issue, I mean, it's a major concern for us as business owners and we've been, we've all worked very hard.

Most of us work probably 60, 70, 80 hours a week actively trying to contribute to the community and be an asset. I notice a lot of the studies that were brought up were where smoking is being banned in restaurants, it seems like the concentration was on fast food restaurants. As a general rule what we find in fast food restaurants you're there maybe 15 minutes, 30 minutes at the most. It's a very quick process. I don't think patrons would be too upset about not smoking for that short period of time. But in

We also feel taverns is another huge problem. It's not, again it's not an in and out process, people are there for long periods of time and, and as a general rule from what most of the people in our industry have said is a lot of their customers are smokers as well as their employees. I myself in my business, we have 12 employees and eight of them are smokers, so again it's going to be an issue of us trying to enforce government regulation instead of maybe the government enforcing their own regulations.

The thing that we're mainly concerned about is a lot of times government comes to us and says -- well, for instance, excise taxes several years ago. They said it's not going to effect your business, you aren't going to have any repercussions from it, and in fact we as business people, we did have some

repercussions and it's kind of upsetting to us as business people having people from the outside of the business environment saying that this is not going to effect business. If you aren't entrepreneurs and you aren't business people it's really difficult for us, for you to come in and say it's not going to effect your business. Our concerns are we're afraid it will affect the restaurant business and especially the tavern business. So that's why we're asking that in these establishments, restaurants and taverns, maybe we're asking that you exclude us from the smoking ban, allow it to be, smoking to be allowed in these places of business. I don't think I have any more comments, thank you for your time. MS. ELAINE PATRICK: What is Fishpaw's? it a bar --It's a package food store. MS. KIM LAWSON: MS. ELAINE PATRICK: Package food store?

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MS. ELAINE PATRICK: So there are customers who aren't coming there and staying to drink, they're

Uh-huh.

FREE STATE REPORTING, INC.
Court Reporting Depositions
D.C. Area 261-1902
Balt. & Annap. 974-0947

MS. KIM LAWSON:

	juac
2	MS. KIM LAWSON: They're just in and out.
3	I'm really not here speaking for my business, I don't
4	think in terms of the package food store it's really a
5	major issue, people are in and out. What I'm speaking
6	for are the people who are members of our association
7	who own restaurants and taverns especially.
8	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: And you're the Anne
9	Arundel
10	MS. KIM LAWSON: Anne Arundel Licensed
11	Beverage Association.
12	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: Thank you.
13	MS. KIM LAWSON: Thank you.
14	MS. CAROLYN WEST: Tina Gray?
15	UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: She left.
16	MS. CAROLYN WEST: She left?
17	UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: She had the time for Dr
18	Ford, he already finished so she left.
19	MS. CAROLYN WEST: Jim Maschas? Louis
20	Thomas?
21	MR. LOUIS THOMAS: Good afternoon.

COMMISSIONER KOELLEIN: Good afternoon.

MR. LOUIS THOMAS: My name is Lou Thomas, I'm the owner of the Yellow House in Washington County, I'm also President of the Maryland State Licensed Beverage Association. The petitions that I've just presented are 21,000 signatures throughout the State of Maryland in a very short period of time, a matter of just a couple of weeks. These signatures represent 21 years and older customers of ours both smoking and non-smoking. These are people who say they think things should be left alone.

MSLBA is in opposition to this regulation for several reasons: One, it basically goes against our legislative process. In legislation a similar bill has been, goes up every year, it has been lobbied to the voters and has been defeated by (papers rustling drown out speaker) pretty well destroys the legislative process, it just seems that you can start a regulation if you don't get your way in legislation. It destroys tourism, with the Inner Harbor and Ocean City being prime tourist attractions you take away smoking you're

taking away, as pointed out a while ago, at least 30 1 percent of the business. Ocean City is close to Delaware with fine beaches also, really no reason for a smoker to go to Ocean City when they can go to Rehobeth 5 or Delaware Beach or Virginia beaches. It will destroy 6 jobs. People are telling us they think it may help our business, but I can't live with think and we know for a fact, talked with our customers, our customers are telling us that they won't be coming in. I live, my 9 business is eight miles from West Virginia. 10 There's no 11 reason for a person to drive in 10 miles to get to meif he can go across the river in West Virginia and have 12 13 his cigarette.

There was, it was brought up a while ago about the bans in California cities, there's an article in <u>USA Today</u>, I'll have to mail that to you, I don't have it with me, but in Los Angeles they put a ban in restaurants a year ago. Now after a year they found out that restaurants have lost an average of \$11,000.00 a month in revenue, the City Council of LA now is considering a repeal of that regulation.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MS. ELAINE PATRICK: Boonesboro

1	MR. LOUIS THOMAS: It's about 10 miles from
2	Hagerstown.
3	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: Who are your customers
4	now? People who live in the area?
5	MR. LOUIS THOMAS: Yes.
6	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: And you have a fairly
7	large proportion of repeat customers? You have your
8	regulars?
9	MR. LOUIS THOMAS: Right, a regular
10	clientele. That's right.
11	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: And what about right in
12	your immediate area, are there other places still in
13	the Boonesboro area, pretty much in Boonesboro?
14	MR. LOUIS THOMAS: Right.
15	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: And that, is there any
16	other tavern
17	MR. LOUIS THOMAS: Yes, there's other taverns
18	there, yes.
19	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: And do those, do you
20	know, you may not know but I'm going to ask you if you
21	do, but whether those taverns also have their own kind

FREE STATE REPORTING, INC.
Court Reporting Depositions
D.C. Area 261-1902
Balt. & Annap. 974-0947

smokers a choice. I have probably 80 percent of my

21

1

2

FREE STATE REPORTING, INC. Depositions Court Reporting D.C. Area 261-1902 Balt. & Annap. 974-0947

consequences. For the government to tell people, or to tell me and my fellow licensees how we have to run cur establishments, who is going to be there to help us when, when our revenues decline or in the case of California when a year down the road the state looks at the decline of revenue and says "We're sorry, we'll repeal that." Now I don't know the case as well as some of the other people but I don't think there's any restitution offered to these establishments after the state made this mistake. So what we're asking you to do is to think very carefully on this independent businessmen and let us run our businesses. this decision and it doesn't work because the people who don't smoke don't want to come in at least I made the decision and I'll suffer from my decision. As far as the, as far as the incident matter, I've had customers who have said to me well if I come into your establishment and I light up a cigarette I've been dealing with you on a regular basis for almost five years, are you going to put me out? And I said I'm going to deal with exactly what the state makes me do.

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Not an ounce more, not an ounce less. And they said well if that's your attitude we're going to have problems. And I don't think that when the Commission, I don't think that you guys have a real good or a clear concept of what happens in a tavern or a restaurant or bar. We're not talking about a 15 or 20 minute visit, we're talking sometimes two, three hours. And for you to ask us to police this I think is very unfair. I saw some of the fines that have been mentioned, up to a \$7,000.00 fine. You know, I don't know how many of 10 these smaller taverns can afford a \$7,000.00 fine, so 11 if you weigh that you might be putting some people out 12 13 of business, and I hope that weighs on your conscience. I don't think that's a very fair fine. 14

And in summary I think that before you were to go further we would like to see some things done legislatively where our elected officials can have some hearings, the elected officials can make some decisions based on, on the testimony that we and the opposition can provide them. I think in fairness that you owe this to everyone in the room. Thank you.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Next speaker please.

21

MS. CAROLYN WEST: Call Steven Buckingham and

FREE STATE REPORTING, INC.
Court Reporting Depositions
D.C. Area 261-1902
Balt. & Annap. 974-0947

decided on this bill obviously that this was the proper

21

procedure, otherwise they would have passed that bill outlawing this procedure.

As you can probably imagine our phones have been abuzz since the Advisory Board's March 2nd recommendation that a workplace smoking ban be enacted. Dozens of workers have called to ask if what they've heard is true, business owners have called to ask when the regulation will take effect. The calls have numbered in the hundreds and all but a few have been in favor of the regulation. I thought I'd share just a couple brief anecdotes with you.

Some of our calls came from restaurant and bar owners in Maryland who have made their establishments smoke free. Everyone of them was annoyed at industry projections they saw in the news that said this proposed regulation would hinder business.

"I've been smoke free more than a year and my business couldn't be better," one bar-restaurant owner told me. "Why are people who have never tried it being put out as experts. A bar or restaurant owner who has

never tried this has no business pretending he knows what's going to happen."

We thought you might want to hear from people like this since they have real life evidence to back up their claims that smoking bans do not hurt restaurant business. We recontacted some of the bar and restaurant owners who had contacted us initially and told them to put their thoughts in writing to you. This is when we got the notice of what was going on. And we have submitted that written testimony for the record and I won't reread that here.

One other call we got that's worth noting is about three weeks ago a Fortune 500 company that is looking to move some of its offices from Happauge, Long Island, the local human resources director from there called our office when he heard about the proposed ban. He said the company had planned to move to Alexandria, Virginia, but was reconsidering because they plan to institute a smoke free policy and it would be easier to move it to a state that limits smoking.

Now I guessed which company this was because

I'm familiar with Long Island, but the human resources
manager begged me not to release the company's name
because employees had not been told that these plans
were in effect and he did pledge to contact you with
his name as soon as employees had been told.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

As we expected dozens of employees called to say how they were medically effected by second hand smoke at work and how relieved they were to hear a ban was going into place. When was the ban going to start, how could they make sure their employer complied. These signs all point to the potential economic benefit a workplace smoking ban might have in Maryland. many other companies will move here because they want to impose smoking bans without hassle? How many more companies will work here because they know that employees who don't smoke at work are more productive and will take fewer sick days on average than those who smoke at work. We urge you to take these points into consideration when pondering the economic impact the workplace smoking ban might have. Thank you very much. COMMISSIONER KOELLEIN: Thank you, sir.

2 Commissioner, my name is Steven Buckingham, I'm here 3 today representing the Maryland Divisions or affiliates of the American Heart Association, the American Cancer 5 Society and also the American Lung Association of Maryland, and we are in fact supportive of these 6 These organizations are voluntary health organizations that represent the victims of disease and the health professionals that are seeking to alleviate 9 or eliminate the causes of those diseases. The most 10 critical part of the regulations from our perspective 11 is the fact that the regulations will establish in law 12 13 the underlying principles that the right of human beings to health is not to be subjected to unwarranted 14 hazards, and that humans should not be subjected to a 15 known cause of a serious debilitating or death causing 16 17 disease unless there is a compelling reason to do so. The Advisory Board, MOSH Advisory Board did an 18 excellent job in examining all of the information that 19 was at hand and we commend them for their efforts. 20 These regulations are clearly supported by 21

The facts include ample documentation that tobacco smoke is a known hazard, not only for those who smoke but those who are subjected to it in the environment. The fact is also that workers are currently exposed to tobacco smoke on the job in sufficient amounts to pose a health danger, and unlike smokers who choose to risk the health effects of smoke where smoking is allowed employees have no choice whether to inhale environmental tobacco smoke. fact is also that ETS exposure is entirely avoidable in the jobsite with the rare exceptions of tobacconists or tobacco research organizations smoking is entirely superfluous to the work environment. And the only regulations by MOSH or OSHA that have allowed a hazardous substance to remain in the work environment are those substances that have been necessary to the industry that is concerned.

1

2

3

4

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

In short, this regulation needs to be adopted and there is no compelling reason or even a demonstrable marginal reason for subjecting workers to environmental tobacco smoke.

You have heard that there are economic concerns with the impact of this on certain populations, certain business specifically bars and restaurants, and yet the testimony and evidence actually submitted to the Advisory Board and at this hearing indicates clearly that the economic consequences are either marginal or positive. have been no witnesses who have testified that they've reversed a decision to go smoke free based on economic factors. Once a place goes smoke free it maintains that smoke free status, and certainly no one can explain to us why bar and restaurant employees are less deserving of this health protection than other employees in this state. They should be treated the same and they should be protected to the same extent as those in another industry.

1

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

You've also heard of smoker's rights or socalled smoker's rights, quite frankly contrary to what the Chamber of Commerce tells you smokers are not a protected class subject to regulation and defense by the Human Relations Commission. The people who are

protected by that body include people of various races, ethnic groups and religions, and I certainly wouldn't put smokers on the same level as an African American, a woman, or a religious minority for protection. That is a smoke screen pure and simple.

There is no right to smoke that could possibly override the right of a person to breathe clean air, and even though smoking has been tolerated for generations it is not an unqualified right and must yield to the right of people to be free from toxins in their workplace air now that the hazards of ETS have been firmly established.

We've also heard a great deal today about overregulation of business. Well quite frankly the fact that the legislature has failed to act in this specific instance is irrelevant. They have given the Department of Licensing and Regulation the authority to protect workers from known hazards, and this body, the MOSH Advisory Board, has acted in concert with that statutory authority. In fact, if we were to leave it up to those people who cry government regulations there

Lastly, public opinion has been raised as an opposition to regulations and claimed as a reason to avoid action on this known toxic substance. Public support for a measure to protect worker or public health is not a criteria for its adoption. This agency is expressly charged with protecting workers and is required to give notice to the public of its proposed action and an opportunity for public comment and that's what we're doing here today. It is not required to obtain the approval of either the legislature or the public to do so. If that were the case we would have every safety and health regulation subjected to referendum. But even if public opinion were relevant to this decision the opinion polls have clearly

indicated support among the population for smoking restrictions in enclosed places, in public places and in workplaces, and we have to recognize that the attempts by the tobacco industry to demonstrate public opposition to these regulations, we should see them for what they are, it's a cynical attempt to manipulate the process to preserve their special economic interests and not a public spirited effort.

As described in the May 1994 issue of

Consumer Reports, a very objective publication that
accepts no advertising and is very objective in it's
reporting, "The tobacco industries and tobacco
interests have challenged smoking restrictions in other
states by setting up fronts; sham organizations, sham
public interest groups." In fact this article is
entitled "Public Interest Pretenders." "They use
innocuous sounding names like Restaurants for Sensible
Voluntary Policy and they are largely funded by the
Tobacco Institute." In fact, in a side bar article
you'll see an article, an analysis of the "30 percent
myth." These so-called public interest groups have

claimed 30 percent losses in restaurant business due to smoking bans and we heard it earlier from Mr. Thomas just a few minutes ago. However, Consumer Reports has analyzed the supporting studies and concluded that they are completely unscientific and biased. Unfortunately the media has continued to report the unsubstantiated 30 percent figure because the tobacco interests and the interests of some restaurants continue to repeat this big lie hoping it will be accepted by the public and the government officials alike.

Lastly, I can't leave this podium I'm afraid without addressing some of the outrageous allegations of bias that we have heard from the tobacco industry representatives about this process. Now in the December 1993 hearing in Frederick the tobacco industry representative called, called that hearing biased and said that the Board had made up it's mind already. Furthermore, the same individual went before the Environmental Matters Committee of the Maryland General Assembly on March 8th and called the MOSH hearing, quote, "A sham from the outset" and indicated his

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	scientific evidence of hazards from ETS were, all of
2	them were beholding one way or another to tobacco
3	industry. But this is an entirely appropriate thing
4	for them to do in order to properly evaluate the
5	information provided. In short, the MOSH Advisory
6	Board performed it's function ably and well, and it's
7	factual findings should be given great deference in
8	your decision on these regulations.
9	Thank you, Mr. Commissioner.
10	COMMISSIONER KOELLEIN: Thank you.
11	(Tape 5)
12	MS. CAROLYN WEST: Commissioner, let me mark
13	what Eric Galley is presenting as Exhibit number 143,
14	and what Steve Buckingham has presented as Exhibit
15	number 144.
16	(The documents referred to as
17	Exhibits 143 and 144 were marked
18	for identification and received
19	into evidence.)
20	MS. CAROLYN WEST: I would now call on either
21	Joe or David Duvall. Then I call on Jacqueline and

1	George Madison:
2	MS. CAROLYN WEST: They're not here? Let me
3	present the testimony that they apparently left. I'll
4	mark that as Exhibit 145.
5	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: This is just testimony
6	from
7	MS. CAROLYN WEST: This is testimony that was
8	submitted by Jacqueline and George Madison.
9	(The document referred to as
10	Exhibit 145 was marked for
11	identification and received into
12	evidence.)
13	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: Do I have any from
14	Duvall?
15	MS. CAROLYN WEST: No. I then call on
16	Raymond Gui for Jane Schultz.
17	MR. RAYMOND GUI: My name is Gui.
18	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: Could you spell that for
19	us?
20	MR. RAYMOND GUI: G U I, Gui.
21	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: G U I?
	I control of the cont

Commissioner, and Counsel, for giving me the opportunity -
MS. ELAINE PATRICK: Mr. Gui, pull your microphone in a little bit. Thank you.

MR. RAYMOND GUI: For giving me to comment on this proposed regulation. Mr. Commissioner, my company has been involved in farming and the sale of tobacco in Maryland for 45 years. I'm a native of St. Mary's County, the mother county of this state, we have grown tobacco for over 300 years. We employ real people which pay real taxes. We contribute in many different

MR. RAYMOND GUI: Uh-huh. Thank you, Mr.

ways to the benefit of our community. We are, Mr. Chairman, Marylanders. This forum, however, is not the time or place to debate the role of tobacco farmers and warehousemen. I would like to discuss this regulation as a businessman in the state. It is difficult for me to imagine that this regulation will prevent me or stop me from being able to design an area or a tobacco warehouse for the tobacco buyers from Europe, North Carolina, and Virginia, a place to enjoy the product

they have just purchased. The same holds true for my 1 employees. I can sell a legal product in a warehouse 2 but I am unable to smoke it if I wish so. Something 3 doesn't make sense here and I submit that I'm not able, 4 5 or unable to comprehend the situation. I think this has gone way, way too far and for whatever it's worth I 6 I have spoken to dozens of 7 submit I am not alone. smokers and non-smokers and they feel the same way. 8 9 Please, Mr. Commissioner, rethink this. Enforcing smoking will be hard if not impossible, and what I see 10 it making lawbreakers out of good citizens who pay 11 taxes when they're, when there is an alternative. 12 Thank you very much, sir. 13 MS. ELAINE PATRICK: Mr. Gui, you also 14 operate a tobacco warehouse? 15 MR. RAYMOND GUI: Yes, ma'am. 16

MS. ELAINE PATRICK: And you made reference

able to smoke what they just purchased? In the course of operating your business do the customers need or

to the purchasers from Europe purchasing, not being

21 ever smoke the tobacco product --

17

18

19

20

1	MR. RAYMOND GUI: They smoke it right in the
2	warehouse, ma'am.
3	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: As a part of the
4	purchase operation?
5	MR. RAYMOND GUI: No, not as a part of the
6	purchase operation but they all, most of them smoke
7	anyway.
8	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: So they're pulling out
9	their own pack of cigarettes to have a cigarette while
10	they're going through and choosing which tobacco to
11	buy?
12	MR. RAYMOND GUI: This is correct.
13	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: They're not testing the
14	wares before they
15	MR. RAYMOND GUI: Well, some of them do.
16	They light a leaf and, and circulate the air so they
17	can smell the aroma of what tobaccoes they have bought
18	or are in the process of buying.
19	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: How common is that?
20	MR. RAYMOND GUI: How common is it? I'd say
21	several of them do it,

FREE STATE REPORTING, INC. Court Reporting Depositions D.C. Area 261-1902
Balt. & Annap. 974-0947

===

1	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: Is that the
2	MR. RAYMOND GUI: Not every day, it's not
3	done on a daily basis, but once in a while you'll
4	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: And how, you have one
5	warehouse that you operate or more than one?
6	MR. RAYMOND GUI: We have three buildings but
7	it's all known as one, one tobacco warehouse.
8	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: So there's three
9	buildings, and how are they constructed?
10	MR. RAYMOND GUI: They're metal buildings
11	with concrete floors.
L2	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: Windows or completely
L3	enclosed?
L4	MR. RAYMOND GUI: Skylights.
L5	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: Skylights. What about
16	the ventilation?
L7	MR. RAYMOND GUI: We have open doors which
18	are approximately 16' wide and they all open
19	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: So by the time the
20	tobacco gets to the warehouse it's already cured for
21	smoking

<u>-</u>

L. Puda

1	MR. RAYMOND GUI: Yes, it's all cured, yes,
2	it's all cured.
3	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: And this is, this, the
4	people who sometimes light these leaves to smell the
5	aroma, this is okay with you? It's a natural part of
6	the business something you just as soon they wouldn't
7	do anyway?
8	MR. RAYMOND GUI: Well, not everybody would
9	do it, just the buyers would probably do it.
10	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: Well who else comes
11	besides the buyers?
12	MR. RAYMOND GUI: All the people that own the
13	tobacco.
14	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: Okay
15	MR. RAYMOND GUI: It's the farmers.
16	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: The farmers are there
17	selling and
18	MR. RAYMOND GUI: Right, and all the help is
19	there also.
20	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: Okay, so it's mainly the
21	buyers then who are

1	MR. RAYMOND GUI: Excuse me?
2	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: It's the buyers that
3	sometimes light the leaves and smell the aroma?
4	MR. RAYMOND GUI: Yes, ma'am.
5	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: And do you generally
6	permit smoking in the warehouse? There's no fire issue
7	with respect to smoking around all these tobacco
8	leaves, these dry tobacco leaves?
9	MR. RAYMOND GUI: Well, we, we let them,
10	buyers and people, smoke in the warehouse. Yes, ma'am.
11	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: So there's no fire issue
12	there with their smoking?
13	MR. RAYMOND GUI: Well we have fire
14	extinguisher stationed all throughout the building plus
15	water hoses in case there's a problem, but we haven't
16	ran into a problem in the 20 years I've been there.
17	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: So then the smoking is
18	simply generally permitted?
19	MR. RAYMOND GUI: Yes, ma'am.
20	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: Okay, thank you.

COMMISSIONER KOELLEIN: Thank you, sir. 1 MS. CAROLYN WEST: Call on Eli Howard. 2 3 COMMISSIONER KOELLEIN: Who is first? MR. CARL BRETALL: We'll go out of turn if it's okay with the Chairman. I'm Carl Bretall, I represent Local 100, the Sheet Metal Workers' International Association and would like to thank the Chairman and the Council for the opportunity to testify 9 on behalf of Local 100 of the Sheet Metal Workers' International Association with an office right here in 10 11 Baltimore. Excuse me. I come to this discussion from another 12 perspective, from the perspective of a member of 13 organized labor and a member of a union that works 14 every day with the complicated mechanics of indoor air 15 16 quality. Many members of the Sheet Metal Workers' International Association are called on daily to make 17 decisions on how air flow in a room or worksite affects 18 workers and what we as professional technicians can do 19 to help improve an indoor environment. 20

We are not scientists or medical

FREE STATE REPORTING, INC. Court Reporting Depositions D.C. Area 261-1902 Balt. & Annap. 974-0947

21

professionals so it is difficult for us to comment on those aspects of this proposed OSHA regulation. But we can talk with authority on the subject we know, indoor air quality. I have asked Eli Howard beside me here of the National Energy Management Institute, NEMI, to discuss the mechanics of indoor air quality with you.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

make two points: The first is that workers benefit most when they are given the opportunity to negotiate with management on any number of important social workplace issues. In the past, most policies governing smoking in the workplace have been handled through the collective bargaining process. As a union we have grave concerns about a government agency's intervention into what we believe is an important negotiable right. We believe smoking policies should be addressed in collective bargaining sessions and not through government mandates.

Secondly, I bring to your attention the extensive work by Federal OSHA on the issue of indoor

air quality. Nearly two years ago it conducted a massive search for information on indoor air quality. It collected data from across the country and on March 28th the Agency proposed a rulemaking on indoor air quality that could preempt the exact regulation that this body is considering.

Maryland OSHA should be commended for its work on this issue. At the same time though, I propose that you defer enactment of this regulation in order to allow time for Federal OSHA to proceed with its own proposed indoor air quality standard. The federal regulatory process for indoor air quality should be viewed as sufficient and renders separate Maryland action unnecessary. Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER KOELLEIN: Thank you, sir.

MR. ELI HOWARD: Mr. Commissioner, Mr.

Patrick, Ms. Patrick, my name is Eli Howard, I'm a

mechanical engineer with the National Energy Management

Institute and I would like to thank you for giving me

the opportunity to address this delegation about this

proposed regulation. I would also like to thank Local

1 100 of the Sheet Metal Workers International
2 Association for inviting me to testify on this
3 important issue.

Again, I represent the National Energy Management Institute which is a national non-profit 5 labor management trust of the sheet metal industry with offices in 11 cities across the country. Both here in Maryland and on a national basis NEMI has been actively 8 involved in the identification of practical solutions 9 10 to indoor air quality problems. During this time we investigated hundreds of buildings and conclude that 11 the primary cause of worker indoor air quality 12 complaints focuses on ventilation deficiencies. 13 most buildings that we have investigated the best 14 solution to the complaints and/or health problems is 15 usually not banning a single source by the proper 16 design, installation, operation and maintenance of the 17 ventilation system, whether smoking is permitted or 18 banned. 19

Our conclusion has been affirmed by the findings of NIOSH, which has also found that the

20

21

majority of indoor air quality complaints were caused by inadequate ventilation systems. Based on practical experience NEMI believes the workers in Maryland would be better served by a regulation that calls for a comprehensive answer to all indoor, all indoor airborne contaminants and one that relies on effective ventilation system design, installation, operations and maintenance. The proposed IAQ regulation announced by MOSH on March 28th is such a comprehensive approach.

Our experience has led NEMI to believe that it is possible and practical to design and install ventilation systems that effectively isolate one area from another, usually in conjunction with the guidelines of ASHRAE Standard 62-1989. The ASHRAE standard is rapidly becoming accepted nationwide and is currently the model for many indoor settings, from movie theaters to classrooms to hospital operating rooms.

Effective ventilation technology can be designed and operated to segregate airflows so that one specific area does not mix with another. Depending on

the building design this may only involve minor modifications to the ventilation system controls and in other cases it may involve more extensive ventilation system changes.

An example of effective ventilation is a project that NEMI recently completed for Blue Cross/Blue Shield in Michigan. Blue Cross/Blue Shield had a smoking ban in effect but reversed it when NEMI supervised the installation of effective ventilation changes for designated smoking areas in the Blue Cross/Blue Shield headquarters building based on ASHRAE Standard 62-1989. The project, excuse me, the project allowed the workers who choose to smoke to do so in selected areas.

Meanwhile, the proposal before us today which calls for the ban of smoking in all places of employment raises an important concern; too often we limit our focus on one area to the detriment of the major more comprehensive solution. For example, NEMI recently worked with the American Federation of Government Employees in the Social Security

Administration facility in Richmond, California, where 2 smoking has been banned for many years. We became 3 involved after a lethal outbreak of Legionnaire's disease in 1991 killed two people and rendered several others severely ill due to the exposure of the 5 legionella bacteria, attributed to the poor indoor air 6 quality and poor maintenance practices. This and other 7 similar experiences have led us to conclude that in 8 9 banning smoking alone we often ignore the larger and more insidious problem of poor indoor air quality. 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Finally, if in fact this body decides to move forward with a proposed regulation I urge you to review the indoor air quality regulation currently being considered by OSHA. The proposed OSHA regulation not only addresses smoking concerns, but broadens the issue to include comprehensive solutions to poor indoor air quality in the workplace. The proposed regulation announced by Federal OSHA on March 28th represents a comprehensive approach to the problem of poor indoor air quality. Since the issuance of the proposed rule by Federal OSHA occurred subsequent to the

consideration of this issue by the Maryland

Cocupational Safety and Health Advisory Board, we

believe that the Department of Licensing and Regulation

should defer to the Federal OSHA Process already

underway.

I would also like to add that NEMI works with many labor unions across the country. Many in the labor community agree with the AFL-CIO resolution that suggests that these types of issues should remain within collective bargaining guidelines. Management and labor have worked successfully through this issue in the past and we have every confidence they can continue to do so in the future.

In closing, I would like to confirm that NEMI is looking forward to working with OSHA in, Maryland OSHA in developing legislation that will address effective ventilation strategies that result in improved indoor air quality. And be happy to answer any questions you might have at this time.

MS. ELAINE PATRICK: Just a couple, I hope.
MR. ELI HOWARD: Sure.

1 MS. ELAINE PATRICK: I'm interested in this 2 Blue Cross/Blue Shield project in Michigan. It says in 3 your statement that the employees were then allowed to smoke in selected areas after ventilation changes. you tell me about those ventilation changes? 5 MR. ELI HOWARD: What we did is we went into 6 7 the facility, it's approximately a 500,000 square foot facility, we have designated smoking areas now set up 8 on every floor in the facility, it's a 10 story facility, and we had designated smoking areas set up 10 where we maintain a negative pressure in those areas 11 related to the surrounding areas, and employees are now 12 allowed to go into those areas to smoke during their 13 breaks and so forth --14 MS. ELAINE PATRICK: 15 I see. MR. ELI HOWARD: -- in lieu of having to 16 travel 10 floors outside or in lieu of not being able 17 to smoke the entire day. Now the similar, a similar --18 MS. ELAINE PATRICK: Is there air 19 20 recirculation? 21 MR. ELI HOWARD: Pardon?

1	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: Does the air from the
2	smoking room
3	MR. ELI HOWARD: It's a 100 percent outside
4	air system. There's no air recirculated within the
5	building, it's 100 percent outside air. We bring in
6	100 percent outside air, we heat it, cool it, take it
7	into the space and it's exhausted 100 percent to the
8	outside.
9	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: And the smoking rooms
10	are exhausted immediately to the outside
11	MR. ELI HOWARD: That's correct.
12	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: Okay. You wanted to add
13	something?
14	MR. ELI HOWARD: I'd just like to add that
15	the Marriott Corporation in Bethesda, Maryland, their
16	corporate headquarters is set up very structured in the
17	same, in the same method there also.
18	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: With a smoking room that
19	is exhausted directly outside
20	MR. ELI HOWARD: That's correct.
21	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: and has negative

*	P-030414:
2	MR. ELI HOWARD: That's correct.
3	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: Do you have any idea,
4	and can you tell me if you do, what this cost for Blue
5	Cross to do this?
6	MR. ELI HOWARD: The overall mechanical
7	system change?
8	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: Well, how big is this
9	Blue Cross building? How many square feet?
10	MR. ELI HOWARD: It's about a half a million
11	square foot facility. It was an extensive cost to do
12	this but they did this in conjunction with some other,
13	other energy operation measures to try to keep the cost
14	down and also they were trying to improve the indoor
15	air quality within the facility. It was an overall
16	major ventilation system change there.
17	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: So do you know an actual
18	dollar figure that you could attribute to the smoking
19	rooms?
20	MR. ELI HOWARD: I could not attribute an
21	exact dollar figure without going back and looking back

1 1/8 1/10

in my files. We did this project, it's been two years 1 2 now. 3 MS. ELAINE PATRICK: And you --MR. ELI HOWARD: I'm sorry I don't have that number on the tip of my tongue for you. I could get 5 that information for you, though, as far as a dollar 7 number per employee or per square foot, something of that nature. 8 9 MS. ELAINE PATRICK: But can you break it, will you have figures that break it out by how much the 10 smoking areas cost as opposed to the overall change? 11 12 MR. ELI HOWARD: Yes. We can provide you with the information on that and we did the study for 13 the Denver Stapleton Airport, the new airport going on 14 up there, and we can, we have got dollar numbers 15 associated with that. 16 MS. ELAINE PATRICK: What study is that that 17 18 you did --19 MR. ELI HOWARD: Just a study we did for the 20 Denver Stapleton Airport in Colorado on the cost of providing designated smoking areas within the airport, 21

1	because that airport originally was designed as a smoke
2	free airport.
3	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: The Stapleton Airport
4	MR. ELI HOWARD: Not Stapleton, the new
5	airport.
6	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: The new one?
7	MR. ELI HOWARD: Right. I'm not sure where
8	that stands right now, we did that study for them about
9	eight months ago to a year, but I've got the
10	information and will show you the dollar cost for that,
11	and I can provide it.
12	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: To revent
13	MR. ELI HOWARD: Yes.
14	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: to reduct and put in
15	the fans
16	MR. ELI HOWARD: Right.
17	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: And the smoking areas
18	that are being contemplated in that study would also be
19	negative pressure, separately ventilated, exhausted
20	directly outside?
21	MR. ELI HOWARD: That's correct. That's the

1	way it was set up in the design. Yes.
2	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: Okay. Yeah, if you can
3	give us some cost figures, Ms. West can give you the
4	information
5	MR. ELI HOWARD: I can get that information
6	to you tomorrow with no problem.
7	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: Great.
8	MR. ELI HOWARD: Okay.
9	COMMISSIONER KOELLEIN: Thank you, Gentlemen.
10	MS. CAROLYN WEST: Commissioner, I'll enter a
11	statement by Mr. Bretall as Exhibit number 146 and the
12	statement of Mr. Howard as Exhibit number 147.
13	(The documents referred to as
14	Exhibits 146 and 147 were marked
15	for identification and received
16	into evidence.)
17	MS. CAROLYN WEST: And I call Mr. Bruce
18	Bereano.
19	(Many people talking at once, cannot discern
20	individual speakers)
21	COMMISSIONER KOELLEIN: Mr. Bereano, do you

•	yield to Mr. Fitcher.
2	(Many people talking at once, cannot discern
3	individual speakers)
4	MR. WILLIAM PITCHER: Thank you, Commissioner
5	and Counsel, my name is Bill Pitcher and I'm here on
6	behalf of the Cigar Association of America opposed to
7	these regulations. I appreciate the opportunity and
8	the consideration of going out of turn, I have to go
9	officiate a Little League baseball game at 5:30 in
10	Annapolis. I have all the equipment in my trunk so if
11	I don't make it the boys don't play.
12	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: That means you can't be
13	late.
14	MR. WILLIAM PITCHER: Yeah. I'll rush
15	through this as briefly as I can, but I have hung in
16	here as long as I might because it is very important to
17	the Cigar Association.
18	First of all I will grant that there is all
19	the good intentions in the world here I'm sure on
20	behalf of all the proponents of these regulations, and
21	in, in many cases I've found the testimony by the

proponents to be somewhat compelling, and again in good faith. But I would summarize these regulations in one statement if I might, and with all due respect I would say that in the position of the Cigar Association these regulations are an overbearing government regulation of lifestyle based on questionable science providing negligible benefits to the people intended to be benefitted but with severe economic negative impact to many many businesses. Why do we make that statement? First of all its our position that these regulations are unneeded; the voluntary efforts that have been in effect in many many instances across the business spectrum over the past few years have, as you even heard from the proponents, yielded significant results in accommodating the smokers and the non-smokers both in the workplace as well as in very many social That voluntary effort has been done in conjunction with basic economics, collective bargaining agreements, human relations policies and common courtesy. These are already addressing the issues and will undoubtedly continue to do so. In that vein we

2

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

would think that these types of regulatory settings would be unneeded.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Education of the populous and these market forces and common sense are, in our position, the way to be going, not government regulation of lifestyle.

Secondly, we would contend that these regulations are basically unenforceable. You're calling -- and this point has been made so I'll be brief, but you're calling on business people and normal citizens who are not in the enforcement of laws' arenas to begin enforcing regulations to, under the threat of severe penalties, and as Ileana can attest on behalf of some other clients of mine over the years in Annapolis dealing with Occupational Safety and Health fines I continually harp on this subject, some of these fines are to the average small businessperson absolutely devastating. They would mean bankruptcy in many cases. To force these people to enforce this sort of thing against their customers or their clients -- In my case for instance I have a small office in Annapolis with two employees, two full time employees, one part time,

one smoker out of my three employees, and many clients that come in and I don't tell them yes or no, if they want to smoke there are ash trays there and they can choose to do so. We don't want to be placed in the position of having to tell our clients, the people that we make our living off of, "I've got to tell you not to do this because if you do I'm going to be subject to fines and I've got to turn you in and you're going to turn me in or my secretary is going to turn us both in." That sort of thing, it's just, it's too much. It's too much for the small businessperson to have to contend with.

Another point is that the legislative policy on this matter I think is fairly clear, there have been numerous instances where these issues have been debated over the last number of years within the legislative context. The legislature I will respectfully remind the Commission, is the democratic process of the citizens, the policy making body of the citizens of this state. We're talking here about an administrative penalty and regulatory scheme without the benefit of

that democratic process. Yes, there have been numerous public hearings and for that you're to be commended, especially given the length of today's, but still we're talking about 188 people in Annapolis who are direct representative legislators of all the citizens of this state that have dealt with these issues on numerous occasions and have chosen not to go this far. We would urge you to, to take heed of that.

Lastly I'd like to just tell you that, how this would affect my client, the Cigar Association of America, in one small sphere if you will. For the last number of years cigars have begun somewhat of a minor rebound in the marketplace in a very limited area, and that's mostly in the higher end cigar products. And one of the ways that that has come about, one of the ways that people like Bill Fader of Fader's Tobacconists has been able to build his customer base and improve the image of the cigar smoker of America is through a series of dinners that the cigar smokers themselves, hosted by their distributors and the Association and other aficionados have hosted around

the country. Very elegant dinners that I've had the
pleasure of attending as a guest of Mr. Fader on a
couple of occasions where they gather and they, they
hear from members of the industry, they sit around and
they have a nice dinner, cocktails, cognacs and
whatever that are designed to go with the various cigar
products that are being introduced. We would not be
able to have those anymore under these regulations.
Because someone works in these establishments where
these dinners are held. And even if we had volunteers
there would still be employees of those halls or
restaurants or private clubs in the case of last year's
dinner that would, under the terms of these regs,
prohibit that sort of activity. Again, this would be
of some economic negative impact to the cigar
distributors of the state.
We urge you not to go as far as these regs
do, and I'll be happy to answer any questions.
COMMISSIONER KOELLEIN: Thank you, sir. Play
ball.

MR. WILLIAM PITCHER: Thank you, sir.

PREE STATE REPORTING, INC.
Court Reporting Depositions
D.C. Area 261-1902
Balt. & Annap. 974-0947

21

COMMISSIONER KOELLEIN: I've heard a lot of excuses to get ahead of somebody, that's the first time I've heard that one.

MR. BRUCE BEREANO: Mr. Commissioner, Madam Attorney General, for the record my name is Bruce Bereano, I'm an attorney in Annapolis and I'm here on behalf of the Tobacco Institute in very strong opposition to these proposed regulations. Some of the arguments I was going to make you've heard from other individuals, I will perhaps touch upon them but not really elaborate on them, I'm just doing that as a courtesy in the question of time not a lack of seriousness or importance --

COMMISSIONER KOELLEIN: We understand.

MR. BRUCE BEREANO: -- to me as well. How did we get here in the first place? My very clear understanding, and I believe I have my facts correct, is we got here because about a year ago or maybe last summer was a very tragic and regretful accident of three workmen on a Sunday in Baltimore City refurbishing or resurfacing a gymnasium floor, someone

lit up a cigar while flammable material had just been 1 laid on that floor, there was a very tragic fire in which the three individuals were killed through the act of smoking. That was the act of negligence, that was the act of carelessness, it was something contrary to current MOSH regulations and a tragic accident 6 occurred. As a result of that the Secretary of the 7 Department felt that smoking in the workplace should be 8 banned to stop and to prohibit such hazardous 9 activities, and the one thing had absolutely nothing to 10 do with the other, absolutely nothing to do with it 11 whatsoever and there were regulations already in effect 12 to prevent and to preclude that; human nature 13 regretfully is always going to occur in a careless and 14 a negligent fashion. But then the Secretary 15 immediately announced an emergency regulation which was 16 one sentence, I think it read "Every employer shall 17 ensure that an employee does not smoke on the 18 workplace. That emergency regulation was immediately 19 withdrawn because of the legal processes, it couldn't 20 have stood the time and a proposed regulation was made 21

to the MOSH Advisory Board, the MOSH Advisory Board made its recommendations and then the Secretary, notwithstanding that, came out with this proposed regulation which is before you.

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

The sad thing to me, and I say this not easily, is that from the outset as I stood in the back room of the first hearing of the MOSH Advisory Board in Crownsville, even before the fact finding debate deliberative process commenced the Secretary advised me a regulation was going in effect; smoking in the workplace was going to go into effect in terms of banning it. And I was just so saddened that the process, the fact finding, the objectivity, the neutrality was not there whatsoever. And despite the health advocates I respectfully saw that the process of the MOSH Advisory Board was true to form to the Secretary's predictions and information. And that is that that process was not to me an open deliberative fact-finding process that was just -- there was such a double standard that was exercised between the witnesses and the scientific experts that were brought

in by businesses, by industry, by the tobacco
companies, and those who were not. And I truly hope
with the utmost respect that at this juncture in the
process that that does not continue, and I see no
indication of that as I've been here all day today.
Because this proposed regulation is absolutely
extraordinary in its impact in the State of Maryland.

The Secretary says it's a health issue, it's not a business issue, it's not an economic issue. It is all three of those things and it is also a big political issue. It's an issue of looking good as an administration closes out and hands the baton over to an incoming administration. The impact of this regulation will be profound and severe on businesses and on the economy, and that is the reality and that must be looked at in a balanced reasonable approach. We have tourism here in the State of Maryland, Ocean City, Baltimore City, our wonderful communities on the eastern shore and in western Maryland. Major legislation and funding were just passed this legislative session to promote tourism and to fund it

aggressively and actively. This proposed regulation is 1 2 inconsistent with that; to ban smoking in bars and 3 taverns and in recreational facilities is contrary to the fostering of tourism. Of people that are not 5 Marylanders that come from other parts of the state and other countries of the world to visit Maryland and 6 7 don't accept and follow the lifestyles that government is seeking to dictate here in the State of Maryland. 8 9 They will not find Maryland to be a happy enjoyable place to visit and to spend money and to come back and 10 to revisit. They will not understand why government is 11 trying to run people's lives which is not being done in 12 13 their communities and in their jurisdictions.

You've heard of the legislative action. The past four or five years the legislature has had presented to it clear and, and comprehensive proposals to ban or to regulate smoking in the private workplace. They have been resoundly rejected each and every time, which is an indication by the legislature that such governmental action as to private industry, as to private lifestyles, as to private places should not be

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

imposed upon the public.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

You heard from the Secretary that the Maryland Restaurant Association supports this proposal. Only in name, only the executive directors because that's convenient for them and they don't really want the hassle and they are copping out and they don't want to fight these proposals any longer. But the vast majority of the membership of the Maryland Restaurant Association does not support this proposal. I surveyed the members of the Restaurant Association in an effort to develop a coalition and found that those responding to me, 2 to 1 they were against governmental intrusion They did not want government in in their workplace. their workplace telling them how to run their restaurants and businesses. And they thought that the Board of Directors of the Maryland Restaurant Association was way out of touch with its membership, and that is very much the case. So I respectfully ask you do not take any weight or comfort in the notion that the Maryland Restaurant Association supports this proposed regulation.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

it. Why? Because you can't let any of your actors or actresses smoke while they're in their employment acting or on a stage or in a movie scene under the draconian rigid black and white characteristics of this proposed regulation.

And finally I would say that where are all the employees, where are all the workers that the health police are advocating that they're protecting and nurturing and mothering? Where are all of them today saying "Give us this regulation, give us this regulation, protect us, protect us?" There are no workers here, there are no employees here clambering for this law, clambering for this protection, clambering for this regulation. Not at all. Because they don't feel it is warranted or necessary and there's no demonstration of support for this regulation to support them in the workplace.

Smoking in the workplace is not a new activity. From time immemorial that there's been smoking in our society people have smoked as they have worked. Smoking has been a part and a normalcy in the

of this regulation would apply for example to my law office in Annapolis, Maryland. I've a small law office, I have employees that are working there

FREE STATE REPORTING, INC.
Court Reporting Depositions
D.C. Area 261-1902
Balt. & Annap. 974-0947

20

21

voluntarily, no one is required to work for Bruce Bereano. I have clients that come in and see me and hire me as a lawyer or hopefully hire me as a lobbyist. No one is required or forced to come into my law office and to hire me, they can go wherever they want. the building, I pay the mortgage, I pay the taxes, I have to meet the payroll. Why can't I run that establishment, why can't I allow my clients and my employees to smoke if they choose to do so. By the government saying "We're not going to allow that," is the government going to pay my taxes? Is the government going to pay my mortgage? Is the government going to quarantee me an income? Is the government going to guarantee me business so I can survive and economically make a livelihood? Of course the answer is no, but the government is going to intrude in the ability to have clients and to have customers that want to come into my office, that will not come into my office and hire me if they've been, they're in criminal trouble or if they're in a domestic relations predicament that they're emotionally distressed and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

they need and want to smoke as they're discussing this problem with their lawyer. Because of their emotional state.

There is a contradiction and a double standard here. No one is forced. And I just use my office as an example. There are millions of businesses. And just as government has the prerogative to say in state and county office buildings we're going to dictate the smoking policy I think private business should be left alone to exercise its own prerogative to determine smoking policy in its own establishments just like government is saying that they have the prerogative to do that in their own establishments.

I respectfully urge your consideration of these views, some of which I've not reiterated, that which you've heard before or really amplified on. I'd be happy to answer any questions that you may have.

COMMISSIONER KOELLEIN: Thank you, sir.

MR. BRUCE BEREANO: Thank you very much.

MS. CAROLYN WEST: Call on Richard Novotny.

MR. RICHARD NOVOTNY: Thank you. Good

afternoon.

ban.

COMMISSIONER KOELLEIN: Good afternoon.

3 MR. RICHARD NOVOTNY: Mr. Chairman,

Commissioner. I'm Richard Novotny and I', here representing the Baltimore 7-11 Franchise Owner's Association. I'm representing 87 franchised 7-11 stores throughout Maryland. We are here today to strongly oppose the adoption of this proposed smoking

These regulations are aimed at individuals smoking inside enclosed workplaces. These regulations would cause great hardship on most business establishments in Maryland. In these hard economic times when we are just coming out of one of our worst recessions why are we driving businesses to the point of extinction? In order for a business to comply with the proposed regulations of the designated smoking area thousands of dollars must be spent, and this must be spent by the proprietor; there's nobody else going to come in and do it for them. And additional valuable service and storage area would be lost due to complying

with the designated smoking area for your employees if they wish to smoke.

1

2

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

It is already very difficult to operate a business in the State of Maryland due to the many 4 regulations that are already on the books. Enforcement of these regulations with the proposed smoking ban would lie with either state or local police administration. They're already overworked and must Я utilize their time for more important issues than to 9 come in and write a citation for somebody smoking. Our 10 11 court systems then would be more overburdened, they're already overburdened now. Our court systems would be 12 13 overburdened and add to their case load.

These regulations would prohibit smoking in any workplace. Not only are we talking about bars and restaurants but convenience stores, even your own private party vehicle, boats, or even your home. We strongly feel that the state is going to extremes with this regulation to control smoking and also the individual's rights. These regulations are excessive and infringe on our rights as American citizens. Our

forefathers founded this country due to excess government control in England. The adoption of our constitution provides certain rights and freedoms of individuals. These rights and freedoms apply to us just as they did 200 years ago. When government tells us where we can and when we can participate in a legal activity, which is smoking, it is no longer a smoking issue but an issue of who has control of your life, government or you.

It is virtually impossible to be a 7-11 business owner to regulate and monitor our stores since we are open 24 hours a day. Yet we have the responsibility for anybody smoking in our store if this would be enacted and could be subject to a fine of \$7,000.00 for a first offense. This is outrageous. People do crimes, I mean, crimes and don't even get fined nowhere near this kind of fine. Totally outrageous. If we got fined \$7,000.00 we'd have to go out of business because I couldn't survive. You're messing with people's lives and livelihoods with this proposal.

Maryland to sell tobacco products. Our customers must pay state and federal taxes when they purchase their tobacco products. Yet with these regulations my customer comes in and buys this pack of cigarettes in my store I'm able to sell it to him because it's legal, but yet if he goes to light it up and smoke a cigarette in my store I got to tell him he can't do that. Even though it's okay for me to sell him a pack of cigarettes.

Our employees who wish to smoke may not be able to because of these regulations. Even if we went to the expense of creating a designated smoking area in our stores how can our employees or ourselves utilize this area when you're only one employer, ourselves, on duty? A lot of stores only have one person on duty at several times throughout the day and in the evening, especially at night. I myself work the midnight shift which is from 12:00 a.m. to 8:00 a.m., and I am a smoker. What am I to do? If I have to go to the designated smoking area and light up a cigarette and

smoke it I leave my store alone, unguarded, and my customers can come in and steal me blind. That's an eight hour shift that I'm not supposed to smoke in because there's nowhere for me to go. Even if I went to the expense of putting in a smoking area, it's totally, it's simply ridiculous.

Many store owners have offices in their own home in order to keep the necessary paperwork on a day to day basis for running our businesses. These regulations would prohibit us from smoking in our own homes because now or home becomes our workplace. The State of Maryland has gone too far with these proposed regulations. If enacted it will force many businesses to close or to relocate to another state. This would have additional losses to the Maryland economy and eventually raise our state taxes which will force even more business to relocate due to higher tax rates.

In our opinion this is a very backhanded and backdoor approach to a very controversial issue.

Smoking in the workplace was brought before the 1994

General Assembly. It was soundly defeated by our

elected officials who listened to their constituents. Why are we here today? Issues that are so controversial as this should be decided by our elected officials and the general assembly and not in this forum, such as this. Issues such as this should be decided legislatively rather than regulatory process. We are sure that many businesses in the state are not even aware of these proceedings today. This issue must be brought before the 1995 General Assembly in order to have a fair hearing on smoking in the workplace.

We strongly urge that you propose, you would withdraw this proposed smoking ban. And one other thing I would like to add, although I am representing the Baltimore Franchise Owner's Association, I am also a charter boat captain and under this bill, being a charter boat captain, if I go inside my cabin, which happens to be my workplace I guess while I'm out on a charter and I light up a cigarette in my cabin I could be reported. Or any of my mates, or my clientele. So this has much much broad reaching effect than just bars or restaurants, because you're dealing with lives and

1	livelihoods of people. And also it is a safety and
2	healthy hazard but is also an economic and life hazard
3	also. Thank you very much.
4	COMMISSIONER KOELLEIN: Thank you, sir.
5	Thank you.
6	MS. CAROLYN WEST: Thank you. Mr. Novotny's
7	statement has been entered into the record as Exhibit
8	number 148.
9	(The document referred to as
10	Exhibit 148 was marked for
11	identification and received into
12	evidence.)
13	MS. CAROLYN WEST: I now call on Larry
14	Holcomb.
15	MR. LARRY HOLCOMB: Good afternoon, Mr.
16	Commissioner, and Counsel. I am not going to submit
17	testimony today, it's in a draft form and I will be
18	submitting it before your deadline. I will get it here
19	before the deadline. Six copies is it that you'd like?
20	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: Uh-huh. Ms. West knows.
21	MR. LARRY HOLCOMB: Six. My name is Larry C.

Holcomb. I have a Ph.D. in the biological sciences. I 2 am a vice president of Holcomb Environmental Services 3 in Olivet, Michigan. I am an environmental toxicologist by background and by training and by experience. My previous experience was in research and 5 6 in teaching largely to premedical students for 11 7 I worked for the Michigan Department of Natural Resources for three years and then I headed up the 9 Michigan Toxic Substance Control Commission for nearly six years looking at exposure of chemicals, whether it 10 be in air, water, soils, evaluating the risk and 11 proposing remedial actions when necessary. 12

I'm going to respond to your proposal, to the science behind it, to some of the comments put forth by the Board in response to some of my earlier comments.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

The Tobacco Institute has asked me to review the proposal to restrict workplace smoking. The Maryland Board has primarily emphasized lung cancer risk and cardiovascular risks. I would like to first, foremost but with less discussion, lung cancer risk. To me the epidemiological evidence is unconvincing.

I've read the EPA report, I find that the compounding involved, especially the lack of looking at dietary factors, to be most distressing as a scientist because those factors, and you had a great long discussion here this afternoon, in fact some 45 or 50 minutes about the basics of epidemiology, and the, what is meant by a low relative risk. When you find such a low relative risk it seems to be inherent that if the literature shows that there are significant dietary factors such as lung cancer risk of what, 1.05? 1.110 found by US EPA? I can show you a multitude for lung cancer relative risks from a variety of dietary factors alone, let alone other air and water factors. So you, you have, you have ignored as well as EPA has ignored and other scientists that have appeared here on your behalf to look at those dietary factors.

2

3

5

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

prinking whole milk alone has a higher relative risk for lung cancer than exposure to ETS in the home. I find that the statistical manipulation of data by EPA is unprofessional to say the least. The residential relative risks are what, 1.05, 1.09 total

when you combine all studies through a meta-analysis,
and what is the occupational exposure? That's what
you're dealing with, it's about 1.0. And dismissing
them as EPA dismissed them when in fact they should be
looked at carefully, I think you're making a big
mistake adn sooner or later it will be brought firmly,
more firmly than I am to your attention.

Now I'd like to discuss cardiovascular risk. The Board dismisses the facts about the Surgeon General and the National Research Council reports in this regard; those reports dismissed cardiovascular risk because they said they could not find evidence to support the cardiovascular risk. EPA did the same thing. They didn't say that, but they ignored the cardiovascular risk and I think they had very good reason to dismiss them. You say, I should say the Board dismisses those facts based on claiming that there were many studies after 1986 that people like Aubry Taylor, Stan Glants and others have reviewed, and in fact the Board claims that there is substantial risk for cardiovascular diseases. I find that the

epidemiology studies in that realm on cardiovascular
diseases are even weaker than are the lung cancer risk
factors. And there are many more confounders for
cardiovascular risk than for lung risk. Remember all
those studies too were done in the home, not in an
occupational setting.

I must and will summarize what's called a table 1 in my, in my data, and I think it's particularly interesting because I will go back to the original papers and I'm going to show you that the evidence of exposure in the papers that the Board has put in their findings are, are something like this:

Carbon monoxide exposure to either animals or humans in experimental studies were very high compared to ambient levels of carbon monoxide and the presence of ETS. The carbon monoxide levels vary between 30 and 1,000 parts per million, whereas ambient exposures from real life, and I've earlier submitted a review of all the North American data on indoor air quality that shows that carbon monoxide levels range right around 3 parts per million as an average. 3. And your earlier

epidemiologist explained to you that, that the, those levels are, he said that they were low and I'm telling you that they are very very low, but he also thought that you could go linear, you could have a linear extrapolation from a higher value where experiments may have been done down to the lower ambient levels that occur. And I'm telling you I, as a toxicologist I'm telling you that isn't the way you treat non-cancer data. You might do that with cancer data, I don't do it all with cancer data because I like to look at individual compounds and look at the merits of that particular compound.

The Board has looked at benzoid-e-pyridine exposures specifically and I can tell you that the, that the doses that were used in the experimentation quoted by the studies that the Board looked at are thousands of times higher than the doses that are, occurred in ETS. For example, for benzoid pyridine the average levels are around 0.7 not micrograms even, 0.7 nanograms per cubic meter in air. To get a dose that would be the equivalent that was given to experimental

animals that you have quoted in your report it would take 30,000 years to get the same dose that you would get exposed to ETS at a restaurant setting. One of the anthracines was also used and I can tell you that the dose there too was thousands of times higher than could possibly be received by the individual.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

The main problem I see is that the Board mistakenly, just as EPA did, mistakenly equates environmental tobacco smoke to concentrated sidestream It can't be done. They're not the same at all. smoke. The concentrations of exposure are greatly different. The Board found all, by earlier testimony about dose of exposure; however, they nor anyone else has disputed by calculated figures or exposure in the 1993 paper. dose is very small whether it's from carbon monoxide or respiratory particulates or nicotine. And, indeed, noill health effects have been reported in the animals or humans at these real life exposure levels. also shows that ASHRAE Standard 6289 will reduce overall exposure fare more than simply banning smoking. On page 29 the Board discusses benzoid

pyridine and I have in an appendix shown you, and I find it very ironic that some restaurant owners will come to you and suggest that they will ban smoking just as McDonald's restaurants have done throughout, in some parts of the country, suggesting that they're going to protect their clientele from this awful thing called ETS, when in fact one hamburger consumption provides the dose equivalent to 6 to 24 months of constant ETS exposure that would occur in a restaurant. 6 to 24 months of ambient air exposure 24 hours a day to get the same dose from eating one hamburger. Now am I saying no one eat hamburgers? Absolutely not. I'm telling you that both doses are very very small but the dose from ETS is minuscule.

The Board on page 48 goes into risk evaluation. My 1993 paper demonstrates conclusively that respirable particulates are very low, that respirable particulates are mainly from other sources. If you do measure them you need to separate out what is from ETS and what is not. My report points out that seldom is the total RSP value above 100 micrograms per

cubic meter and the World Health Organization guideline
which is the only guideline that I'm aware of regarding
ETS specifically, their guideline of 100 to 150
micrograms per cubic meter from ETS is rarely, if ever,
exceeded. Only perhaps in bars where ventilation is
insufficient.

My data also shows that where RSP's of 100 micrograms per cubic meter is exceeded it is very probable that the ASHRAE standard is not met.

I would recommend this in finality. I have several recommendations to the Board. First of all and most importantly stop equating concentrated sidestream smoke to environmental tobacco smoke. The data simply do not justify this. Secondly, recognize the faults of epidemiology studies and the many compounders that are involved. Thirdly, have your staff carefully reevaluate the cardiovascular literature, identify the great number of confounders and recognize the disparity in the research doses given either to animals or to people in an experimental mode and in a real life scenario. Fourthly, recognize the difference in

the issue and that is to try to get a handle on reducing exposure to all of these things combined.

I've submitted a paper to you, it models all, several different types of compounds found in ETS, but also coming from other sources and it shows you what ventilation will do in actually reducing all of those compounds.

I thank you very much for the opportunity to be here today and to give you my thoughts and I'd be glad to answer questions.

COMMISSIONER KOELLEIN: Thank you, sir. Any questions? Thank you, sir.

MS. CAROLYN WEST: Call William Lecos.

MR. WILLIAM LECOS: I must commend you on your patients, you've done well under this rather long day. Thank you for the opportunity to speak. My name is William Lecos and I'm Executive Vice President of the Restaurant Association of Metropolitan Washington. My association was founded in 1920 and for 73 years has represented the interests of restaurants in the greater metropolitan Washington area. Our dues paying

membership includes over 140 companies operating over 340 food service establishments in Maryland, primarily in Montgomery and Prince George's Counties.

I come before this Board today to speak in opposition to the inclusion of restaurants bars and taverns in the proposed regulations. Our position is based on simple economic reality, that such a ban will jeopardize the economic vitality of Maryland restaurants located in the metropolitan Washington area.

Let me state up front that the issue which brings us before you today is not in my view smoker's rights, rather it's the rights of entrepreneurs and business owners in this state to meet the needs of their customers and their employees without government mandates. We are a hospitality industry, our very survival depends on our providing customers and employees a safe and comfortable environment. When we fail to meet these basic needs we face the most serious form of censure, our customers go elsewhere and we go out of business. Or our employees choose to work for

more accommodating employers and we lose our most valuable business asset, our people. It is this fundamental mechanism which governs all of our business practices, and while the restaurant industry remains an extremely difficult business in which to make a buck I know of no instance in which a restaurant failed because they offered accommodation for both non-smoking and smoking patrons, or because their employees have refused to work in such an environment.

I can speak of many instances where the vitality of restaurant operations has been jeopardized by legislation or regulation banning smoking; in California, Illinois, New York, local restaurant smoking bans have had a devastating effect on our industry and have cost restaurant workers jobs. The most recent issue of the National Restaurant Industry trade magazine, Restaurant Business, and I believe that's the May issue, features an article detailing the impact of such a ban in Arlington, Texas. In this article business effected by that ban have losses of 25 to 30 percent of their business while business in

adjoining jurisdictions increased a proportional amount.

2

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

While my distinguished colleagues from the Restaurant Association of Maryland claim that a state wide ban on smoking in restaurants bars and taverns would not disadvantage Maryland businesses, such a ban would have a much more local character to it if you happened to operate a business in the Washington DC suburbs or perhaps the resorts of Ocean City. It is doubtful that patrons will drive an hour from Baltimore in search of a restaurant to accommodate a smoking dinner companion, nor will employees go that far in seeking employment in the industry, those employees will work elsewhere, those patrons will stay home. However, if you operate in Silver Spring, Rockville, Temple Hills, College Park or any other suburban location the suggestion that a state boundary alone will prevent customers from taking their business into the District of Columbia or Virginia where no such ban exists is a suggestion which defies our industry' experience and risks the livelihoods of Maryland

restaurant operators.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Again, I state the issue is not one of smoker rights it is a question of the rights of business operators to meet the needs of their customers without governmental dictates. Maryland restaurants have a long proven record of accommodating their patrons. the pattern of consumer behavior has changed so has our level of accommodation. Restaurants today provide far more non-smoking capacity because that is what our customers' needs have demanded. Many restaurants today are making the choice to go completely smoke free; I believe that trend will continue as more and more customers request and respond favorably to having the option of a smoke free environment available. Those choices are being exercised today by operators seeking to meet the needs of their customers and their employees, not because of any government mandate.

Free choice in the free market will decide this issue as customers vote with their feet as to their dining environment of preference, and employees vote with their feet as to their employment environment

of preference. The function of the free market has never been improved by the injection of government fiat.

On the issue of government mandates what is particularly troubling about these hearing is that we're speaking to a regulatory agency deliberating the very same issues which have been examined, deliberated and adjudicated by the recently closed Maryland General Assembly session. After examining the same body of testimony as this Board the elected representatives of the citizens chose not to impose a smoking ban on Maryland restaurants. Now exercising a slightly different tack the regulatory body is seeking to unilaterally impose regulations that the legislature saw as unwise for the State. This cannot be the process of governing which best serves the people in the Free State.

We are a hospitality industry, we know the importance of our customers' safety and happiness. We go to great lengths to ensure that our customers leave with a good taste in their mouths and a desire to come

back. As an industry we have instituted plans to ensure that our non-smoking customers eat in a comfortable environment and that our smoking customers have the right to smoke without inconveniencing others. We are also an industry that is among the most labor intensive of all enterprises; to stay in business we must be concerned for the health and safety of our employees as any other industry. As employers we must accommodate the needs of our employees in the same manner as we accommodate the wishes of our guests; the reason is simple, if we don't employees will go elsewhere for their paycheck. This is an industry which offers a tremendous degree of competition for employees. Employees exercise their options of mobility all too frequently to suit most operators. the option of working in a smoke free environment is attractive to employees those employers offering such an environment will reap the benefit of a more stable work force with lower turnover and therefore more productivity and lower cost. These benefits are realities that operators are already aware of and that

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

they can freely choose to provide without government mandates.

Providing for our customers and employees' needs is the most important requirement of our business. By accommodating both non-smoking and smoking patrons we don't risk the chance of losing our customers to neighboring jurisdictions who don't limit choice, such as the District of Columbia and Virginia. By providing a safe healthy and productive workplace we attract and keep the best employees. Mandates that put government between restaurateurs and their customers or their employees risk the livelihood and economic vitality of Maryland restaurants. We urge you to consider this and at the very least amend the proposed regulations to exclude restaurants, bars and taverns from its restrictions. Thank you.

MS. ELAINE PATRICK: Are you familiar with any restaurants in your particular association or bars or any establishments in your association that have prohibited smoking throughout, throughout their establishment?

1 MR. WILLIAM LECOS: Yes, actually many restaurants I would characterize it as such. 2 3 MS. ELAINE PATRICK: Many have prohibited 4 smoking generally? 5 MR. WILLIAM LECOS: Are offering a smoke free 6 environment for all of their patrons, and they've done 7 that, I emphasize, without government mandates 8 requiring them to do so. MS. ELAINE PATRICK: And these are in the DC 9 metropolitan area? 10 MR. WILLIAM LECOS: Some are in Maryland, 11 some are in Virginia, some are in the District of 12 Columbia. They range from chain operations, fast food 13 theaters which have been in the paper recently, Taco 14 Bell and McDonald's both corporately going non-smoking 15 to independent full service restaurants of long 16 17 standing, Mrs. K's Toll House for example being one in Silver Spring Maryland, Carlisle Grand Cafe in 18 Arlington Virginia, the delicatessen in my office building is a smoke free environment. 20 MS. ELAINE PATRICK: Is your office building 21

1	in the District, or
2	MR. WILLIAM LECOS: It is in McLean,
3	Virginia.
4	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: In McLean. So there are
5	a number of the establishments in your association that
6	have chosen to prohibit smoking and then stayed with
7	it?
8	MR. WILLIAM LECOS: That is correct. There
9	are others who have attempted it and have not, not
10	chosen to stay with it over time reacting to the
11	demands of their customers.
12	MS. ELAINE PATRICK: Okay, thank you.
13	COMMISSIONER KOELLEIN: Thank you. Out of
14	necessity I'm going to declare a five minute recess.
15	When I come back we'll stay at it until we finish up.
16	(Off the record.)
17	(Back on the record.)
18	COMMISSIONER KOELLEIN: We're back on the
19	record now ladies and gentlemen. Ms. West, if you'd
20	call the next witness, please?
21	MS. CAROLYN WEST: I would call Doris Hughes

COMMISSIONER KOELLEIN: Doris Hughes. Did I say that correctly?

1

2

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MS. DORIS HUGHES: Yes, sir. My name is 3 Doris Hughes, I have been a smoker for many years. 4 husband and I own and operate a tavern in East Baltimore. I feel like the State of Maryland is taking 6 my rights away as a smoker, business owner and 8 individual person. Our income from our tavern come from people, neighbors and friends, of their choice to 9 come and watch a baseball game, have a few drinks, 10 socialize and smoke if they choose. All I ask is for 11 the individual businesses and owners to have a choice 12 13 if they want a non-smoking or smoking business.

Earlier it was stated about a restaurant that went non-smoking and their business was not affected. It goes to show at this point people have a choice, but what are statistics after the people have no choice? Where are the small businesspeople that have retired people who have been smoking for years, come enjoy a few beers, socialize in the afternoon, have a few cigarettes. Once the ban goes through we can't have

1	that business no more. Our establishment has 15, 16
2	barstools and we have pool leagues, shuffleboard
3	leagues, our clientele is 40 years old and older. How
4	can we tell these people we're no longer going to be in
5	business, we can't let you smoke while you have a beer.
6	I'm just asking to reconsider as far as making it a ban
7	and give us our choice. Thank you.
8	COMMISSIONER KOELLEIN: Thank you.
9	MS. CAROLYN WEST: Michael Hughes?
10	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER (Too far away from
11	microphone to hear.)
12	MS. CAROLYN WEST: I'm going to kill the last
13	name here, Steven Cotsoradis.
14	MR. STEVEN COTSORADIS: My name is Steven K.
15	Cotsoradis, I own the Garden Bar and I'm also the
16	President of East Baltimore Licensed Beverage
17	Association. I'm going to put it on record that our
18	association is against this regulation. It would hurt
19	us financially.
20	This, our taverns which you would call, a
21	friend of mine once mentioned, they're the local

country clubs of the poor people. The locals come in there, it's like their little country club. They come in there to socialize after work, have a few beverages and smoke. My bar, at least 90 percent of the people smoke. I have in there an exhaust fan, I've got two smoke-eaters, and most of our tavern members, they all have some type of an exhaust. We're all working at it. We're working people and we put in anywhere from 12 to 14 hours a day in our tavern, so we're not going to have a tavern air atmosphere of any danger that we can prevent for our employees, we're there working in the same atmosphere so we're going to look after it. And they, he said something about, a gentleman, a room 20 by 28, they've had ventilation and they tested it. they actually, would they go into a real tavern where we have smoke-eaters, we have large exhaust systems and test the air there? They're testing it in a closed environment which I don't know what ventilation they're using, they said it was according to code. Well, if I can remember back far enough, code, I don't remember any ventilation provision in the code for me when I had

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 | my bar built.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

19

20

21

And another little thing, why do we have to police it? When they, if somebody smokes in the stadium or someplace else who gets the fine? The person that done the smoking? In our business now, if somebody come in my place and lit up a cigarette, somebody happened to catch him I get fined which I don't think is very fair. And like other members, we want to be able to be the ones that decide if we want a smoking bar or if we want a non-smoking bar. You can put a sign outside that this is a smoking tavern, it's hazardous to your health, if you want to come in you're welcome. All my employee, all of them but one, that's my son, he doesn't smoke. My son doesn't smoke, all the rest of them smoke in my bar. I don't smoke either but that's their privilege. I wouldn't, they would have to go outside and smoke. It would be very, hardships on us with this new regulation that you're putting in. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KOELLEIN: Thank you, sir.

MR. STEVEN COTSORADIS: Any questions? No?

MS. CAROLYN WEST: Steven Sklar. 1 MR. STEVEN SKLAR: I'm Steve Sklar, 2 representing today the Public Affairs Committee of the 3 Maryland Heart Association's Maryland Chapter, and also a former member of the Maryland General Assembly. 5 Commissioner Koellein and Ms. Patrick, the 6 7 procedure with the, today's regulations has been characterized by its opponents as a political issue, one that looks good at the end of an administration that's about to end its 4 years. A look good feel good 10 measure. I would recharacterize this whole process not 11 as political expediency but an exercise in political 12 guts. This isn't something that either the 13 Commissioner or the Secretary or the Governor is doing 14 to make points, they're doing something that's 15 protecting people and protecting employees 16 specifically. 17 At least seven witnesses have come to you 18 today that the proposed regulation and particularly the 19 issue of bars and restaurants is a matter for the 20

FREE STATE REPORTING, INC.
Court Reporting Depositions
D.C. Area 261-1902
Balt. & Annap. 974-0947

legislature, and that in effect the Division is

21

preempting the legislature who has already spoken in numerous years, particularly this year, by not passing legislation that it attempts to do in statute what the regulation attempts to do in its own procedure. I would disagree with that characterization as well for a number of reasons:

there had already been prefab bills to accomplish no smoking in public accommodations and in the workplace. So the regulation came out with a prefab. Those of us who testified as proponents of the legislation asked the committee to report it unfavorable, unfavorable in view of the subsequent development that was the issuance of this regulation which in our opinion was much more comprehensive than its coverage and much better substantiated by a record that could be successful in any subsequent challenge in the courts. Now the legislature in three or four hours of hearing at a committee level was not able to build this impressive record that you have here with scores and scores of expert witnesses, files of exhibits, boxes of

records that have been submitted as part of the record that could very easily withstand any legal challenge as to the substantial nature of the evidence presented for this regulation, and that's why I as one of the witnesses and as proponents did submit to the legislature to defeat that bill in deference to yours. Others have too and we'd be glad to submit written statements that were part of the legislative record to you to show that position.

We also know that the MOSH Advisory Board as well as the Commissioner are statutorily delegated this responsibility by the legislature to determine conditions in the workplace that are detrimental to health and impaired function, and to protect employees. The legislature in fact delegated this authority to you to make these determinations and you did it and you did it splendidly. There was a bill, submit bill 856 that was introduced after the defeat of the public accommodations and workplace legislation that would have restricted your department, your agency from issuing this regulation in specific smoking areas.

3

4

5

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Let me make a comment on suggested additions to your regulation in language. The first is the omission of the temporary but very important health implications of smoking to the employee short of mortality. The record of the Advisory Board is replete with witnesses, at least five employees and Dr. Bascomb, which are applied by the Board to show the temporary but significant material impacts on health and work function. Those include sinus conditions, headaches, bronchial constriction which I can complain of, aggravated heart conditions, those who are enduring cancer treatment and radiation, respiratory effects, tearing, blepharitis, all these kinds of ailments that are occasionally caused by smoking in the workplace short of mortality 20 to 30 years later. These have a very definite impact on health in the immediate sense and also particularly on work function which is part of

the responsibility under statute for this Agency to determine. So I would suggest this language in the statement of purpose: "Compelling evidence establishes ETS as a cause of acute and material impairment of health and functional capacity." I think the record supports that as the Advisory Board and particularly the witnesses today, the employees who talked of their inability to perform, their unwillingness to leave their job but their having to leave their job because of these conditions, et cetera, so that should be part of the findings in the statement of purpose.

б

I would also suggest in the last paragraph, the regulation, under the provision that talks about the "Chapter may not be construed to," I would add a new C, "Prohibit or impede an employee recourse to any assisting legal remedies." I think that's important that should there be an exemption along the way either by this Agency or the courts, that it may not be used by a defendant employer to obviate any liability in Workman's Compensation or willful injury complaints by employees. So that language ought to be there so

there'd be no unfair interference.

2

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

I think that most of us are very thankful in the health community and in the general public for what you've done for employees, from eliminating harmful and dangerous environments, from altercations and tension among fellow employees, from unnecessary confrontations with their employers, and from the horrible and mean dilemma of having to choose between one's health and one's job. Also, for people seeking employment if they are health prudent and follow the medical warnings from the authorities that you have heard from and from others they cannot effectively apply for a job in a facility that elects, by choice, to have smoking in that facility. It's constructive discrimination of employment opportunities, that employer becomes, effectively, a non-equal opportunity employer, Mr. Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER KOELLEIN: Uh-huh.

MR. STEVEN SKLAR: We wish you luck, we wish you success, and you know you have many friends in Maryland to help you in this effort.

Ţ	COMMISSIONER ROELLEIN: Thank you, Bir.
2	Questions? Thank you.
3	MS. CAROLYN WEST: Susan West?
4	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Gone.
5	MS. CAROLYN WEST: Gone. Charles Secola?
6	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Gone.
7	MS. CAROLYN WEST: Angus Everton. I know
8	he's here.
9	MR. ANGUS EVERTON: Here. Thank you, Mr.
10	Commissioner and Counsel. I'm Angus Everton, I am here
11	on behalf of the Medical and Chiurgical Faculty of
12	Maryland, which is the State Medical Society, the
13	professional society of the physicians in this state.
14	We have approximately 7,000, 6 to 7,000 members all of
15	whom are physicians licensed to practice medicine here.
16	I am here as a general counsel to MEDCHI,
17	which I'm their lawyer. I'm also a private attorney, I
18	am in private practice as a trial lawyer and that will
19	be significant in some of what I tell you in my
20	testimony. I will try to stick with things that have
21	not been said too many times today already and I think

I can do that pretty easily on some of the scientific point. I do want to reiterate, however, MEDCHI in September of last year took the position at it's semiannual meeting to support any legislation or regulatory activity that would impose prohibition on smoking in enclosed indoor public places. MEDCHI strongly supports your efforts on behalf of the employees in this state to promulgate these MOSH regulations. All of the physicians, the physicians of Maryland see this purely and simply as an issue of public health.

As a regulatory agency that was created for the overwhelming purpose of protecting the public health of our State's employees this sort of regulation is precisely the thing from a legal perspective that the general assembly empowered you to do. It is simply erroneous for anyone to come up here, anyone who purports to be a lawyer to come up here and say that what you are doing is contrary to the mandate of the General Assembly. Mr. Sklar said it quite well, the General Assembly had three opportunities this session

to stop what you were doing, twice through the indirection or preemption and once through a bill that would have directly prohibited. And in all circumstances those bills were defeated and in at least two of those circumstances I'm personally aware that tobacco interests were behind the bills that were defeated. The last bill technically was not defeated, it was withdrawn by Senator Bromwell, it was withdrawn with the axe coming down right behind it; it would have been defeated if it had not been withdrawn. And it was defeated for good tactical reasons but let us not make any mistakes; that bill was a dead duck.

I've heard something today that has been a constant theme throughout a lot of the testimony and that is you ought to allow the majority of our employees who want to smoke on the job the right to smoke. I have some real question about the anecdotal evidence of whether these, there is a majority who actually wants to smoke or does smoke, but if that be so that is all the more reason why you should act in the way you are acting, because you're, it is incumbent

exercise, this is an exercise in the protection in the exercise of the public health and you're doing that thing and that is appropriate as I believe I've testified, it is precisely what you are empowered to do. Thank you for doing it. Please do so. If democracy were important, however, as a matter of serendipity I got ahold of a New York Times/CBS poll that came out on Compuserve last Sunday, two days ago,

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

in which they polled 1215 adults and they said a lot of things, many of which were very unfavorable to the tobacco companies but since we're not engaging in anything ad hominem here I won't get into it, but one of the things that came out was that 67 percent favor a complete ban on smoking in all public places. It seems to me, and I won't go into this long, but something that has not been said also today is that tobacco does occupy a unique position in the history of the United States and particularly in the history of Maryland, it was a very respectable thing to be a grower and seller of tobacco for many generations; centuries in this state. It still has a tail effect of respectability if you will, but this is a situation where in the last 30 years -- I became addicted to tobacco myself when I was 11 prior to this 30 year event -- in the last 30 years it has become recognized that tobacco is a deadly poison. Not merely a carcinogen but an agent for heart That it creates birth defects. Many things, disease. many many evil health effects are attributed to tobacco that simply weren't attributed to it 20 years ago, 30

1

2

3

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

years ago. By definition our social attitude, our regulatory and our legal attitude toward this product have got to change, and the protection of the public from the effects of tobacco smoke is paramount. It's paramount. It's more important than convenience, it's more important than convenience, it's

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

My law office banned smoking three years ago. That's how I'm getting into my business as a trial lawyer. We banned it in the office three years ago, either by clients or by people in there. I raised hell. I was the only person to do so. I don't smoke now, I quit 20 years ago by the way, it was very difficult to do. Quit smoking cigarettes that is, still smoked a pipe for a while after that. Gave that up because of the ban. I said this is a very unfair thing to do to the staff here, we're under a lot of stress here, these people enjoy their cigarettes, it's one of the few things that they can do as a matter of pure pleasure and they ought to be able to do it and still work at the same time. My partners told me basically to go -- you know, that I was all wet and

that we were going to have this ban and if I didn't like it that was just too bad. We have had the ban and I have to say I was dead wrong. The, the staff and the attorneys there have not had a problem complying with the non-smoking ban. We had one client that I'm aware of in the three years since then who became outraged because he couldn't smoke. He was allowed to on one occasion and the office, all of the office raised so much hell about it that when he returned for another client interview we wouldn't let him do it again. We have let no one smoke there since then. Economically has it done -- I heard Bill Pitcher sit right here and say that it might drive him into bankruptcy if he had to stop smoking in his office. Well we went from 12 lawyers to 25 over that period. I won't, certainly not attributable to the fact that we don't smoke in that office but it sure hasn't hurt us any. I don't believe that any, that any adverse economic evidence has come before you today, I don't think I heard one shred of evidence. I have heard people say "I'm concerned that people will go out of state if I close down the smoking

3

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: William Wright.
2	MS. CAROLYN WEST: Is that you?
3	MR. WILLIAM WRIGHT: Yes, it is.
4	MS. CAROLYN WEST: Would you like to speak?
5	MR. WILLIAM WRIGHT: Yes.
6	MS. CAROLYN WEST: Please come forward. Sir,
7	could you state your name and spell it? I didn't get
8	it
9	COMMISSIONER KOELLEIN: Excuse me, is this
10	the one we were looking for, Carolyn?
11	MS. CAROLYN WEST: Excuse me?
12	COMMISSIONER KOELLEIN: Is this the one we
13	were looking for? Is he the final one that
14	MS. CAROLYN WEST: No, apparently there's
15	another gentlemen.
16	COMMISSIONER KOELLEIN: Okay, he's next to
17	last then. Okay.
18	MR. WILLIAM WRIGHT: Mr. Commissioner,
19	Counsel, Counsel. My name is William Wright, I'm an
20	attorney in private practice in Ellicott City,
21	Maryland. I live in Catonsville. I've been trying for

over 20 years to get the protection that your regulations are proposing. I've testified many times at the county and state levels to have the protection, it hasn't been provided. There is no other product, there is no other industry like tobacco and the tobacco industry.

During the Viet Nam war 65,000 deaths are reported and I believe approximately 400,000 injuries. This is over a 10 year period. In this country alone in one year 430,000 people more or less are killed by tobacco related illnesses. Millions more are maimed or in other ways incapacitated.

As I recall the initial regulations that were promoted by one of the articles or at least one of the studies in Maryland that Maryland is either first or second in cancer deaths I was very proud that Mr. Fogle introduced the proposed regulations to provide employees of Maryland smoke free areas. They're important, they're needed.

Mr. Bereano said that the explosion that killed three workers really should not be considered as

part of your considerations, but what if none of those people smoked, they would be alive today.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

The prior administrations of this state have ignored the health data and the pleas of the public for many many years. This is the first time our governor and our administration have stood up and been counted and are doing what is necessary. The Agency has a directive, that is to provide safe and healthful work environments for all employees; not some, not just a few, but all. This is not a voting issue. If one person is hurt that person needs to be protected. exclude tobacco smoke coverage from your regulations I feel means that many regulations that are imposed upon business shouldn't be there because it imposes the burden upon them. I often think about why we require them to use stainless steel cooking pots rather than aluminum; aluminum they say, cooking pots, cause Alzheimer's. How many of us would still be eating out of aluminum pots and pans rather than stainless steel.

I'm often reminded when I attend these sessions that probably around the turn of the century

when spittoons were taken out of public places, I could just hear Mr. Bereano and those that support him complain about spittoons. I feel if someone wanted to spit as long as it's not in my direction it would be okay, but unfortunately when someone smokes I participate in that smoking. I can remember early on when I testified with the State Legislature that many of the representatives and some of the people who were opponents would smoke in the room and they would mock and laugh at us. I can assure you today that if we were back 20 years and you were starting out today it would probably happen. It is so nice to be able to come here and not have to breathe and endure the smoke that we had to endure then and suffer the headaches that many of us had.

The current regulations I believe are real good, there is one part though or several parts that I think should be corrected, one of which deals with the door that would be part of the wall enclosure of the smoking area. I think the regulation should be changed that it should remain closed and open only when people

go in and go out of the smoking area. I also share the concern that tobacco smoke in that room would leach out into the non-smoking area either through the ventilation system or because the ventilation would not be, the positive air, the good air would not be drawn into the room.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

I brought today a letter that I keep bringing it out but I never hear about it from anybody else. received a letter dated March 8th, 1976, from the Phillip Morris Company, and I'll make a copy and add a copy today. I had written to them asking for the number of chemicals that were in tobacco smoke because during that time there were full page ads for American cigarettes saying that there were 2,000 ingredients in tobacco smoke. The letter I got back said that there were over 6,000 compounds that have already been In 1978 I spoke with a detected in tobacco smoke. research scientist of the Department of Agriculture, unfortunately I did not document this, but as I recall it he said there was not 6,000 there was over 36,000 individual components of tobacco smoke. In this

letter from Phillip Morris they refer me to a report from the Department of Agriculture that refers to the composition of tobacco smoke, and I'm provide a list here if you want it for your scientists or whatever you have in the Department, they can better explain the chemicals to you than I can, but on this page which is table III there are two columns of cancerous causing chemicals, and what is -- it's bad enough to have this list which I think I counted 98. The synergistic effects of these chemicals, the other chemicals that are on the list, the chemicals that are in our air and are in our food I believe are part of the problems causing so much cancer in Maryland. We are in an acid state, acid air state. We think that we go out of a smoking area at the end of the day into fresh air but we really don't, we go into an acid air area and the acid air causes further harm to our lungs because of the smoke that's in the air in the workday.

1

4

5

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

I have another table here that came from the National Cancer Institute that lists more carcinogenic and cocarciogenic substances which I'll make available

today.

Also linked again to my experience with the Health Care Financing Administration and SSA Agencies at Woodlawn, when I started there back in 1973 I was required to work in a one story building that was normally, it was built I understand for about a dozen people. We had 150 people assigned to that building. The smoke was so strong you could see it, it was in layers, it would just hover in the air. So many complained about it that they brought people up from the HEW in Washington to get an air sample that day, and I can remember, it was like a windstorm in that building, it was so fresh and the air was coming around, they determined there was no problem and the next day we were back to normal with the low ventilation and a lot of smoke in the area.

You've heard today that businesses are claiming they have a right to determine what is right for the public. If they had been doing in the past what would be right for the public probably at least half of the Maryland code would not be in existence

today. The reason it is there is that people don't do what they should do on behalf of the public, and I think your regulation probably would go two pages, maybe three pages of the Maryland Code, and would hardly increase the volume of the Code and that's why, another reason why it is needed; it is not a burden on them, a few signs on the doors would do it. If you go into Columbia Mall now there's still one or two people out there smoking but the vast majority know when they go into the mall there's no smoking and they do obey.

One of the things I do as part of my reward for providing places that provide me with a no smoking area involves the Columbia Mall. It wasn't a lot of money but I was going to buy clothes, I had \$600.00 I wanted to spend. I live in Catonsville, I could have gone to Security Mall, I could have gone to Westview, but I drove all the way to Columbia so that I could spend my money there and reward those businesspeople for providing a smoke free area.

I would also like to share my experience with Wendy's out on Route 40 in Ellicott City. I think it's

roughly a 40 foot square building. They had, and I haven't been there in five years, I don't know if it's changed, but at that time they had one table about 2' square, above that was a post card size sign that said I don't go there. I go into Roy Rogers no smoking. because I had heard they prohibit smoking, they had the no smoking section in the middle of two smoking When you walk in the doors while you're sections. waiting for your food that's where the smoking is permitted. The Inner Harbor, the buildings stand around the waterway are supposed to or already have prohibited smoking within those buildings. If they've done it I'm sure they've already investigated its effect on tourism, and I'm sure that probably the people that have gone in there and complained about the tourists and that's why they've done it.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

You'll notice today a lot of clapping from those that oppose your regulations by their speakers. I often, as they were doing it I was wondering if when those people, their friends get cancer or emphysema and they go to the hospital or wherever they go to visit

them are they going to clap then? I doubt it.

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

I had an experience with my barber, he has a built room that's maybe about 20 feet wide and 40 feet long, he's in there by himself, he has three or four chairs but he's the only one there. One day one of the people that was sitting there waiting smelt gas towards the back of the room, they called Gas and Electric, there were children in there besides myself. A smoker came in, walked to the back of the room and continued to smoke, but yet the barber said nothing to him even though they had smelt smoke and called the Gas and Electric people to come out. He wants this regulation, this type of regulation. I've talked to him many times. The reason he can't do it is that he doesn't want to offend those that smoke, that they would go elsewhere to have their hair cut and he can't afford to do that. But if it was done by governmental agency he's definitely in favor of it.

I don't mean this to be mean or nasty but it's an honest feeling on my part. When I hear the opponents to the regulations such as this over the

FREE STATE REPORTING, INC.
Court Reporting Depositions
D.C. Area 261-1902
Balt. & Annap. 974-0947

專

years and again today I am reminded of what occurred
during the Nuremberg Trials I see on TV from time to
time. These people didn't do anything wrong, they were
just obeying their military rulers. I'm also reminded
now that there are people who say the Holocaust never
happened. This is what I'm reminded of when I hear
these people speak, they say there's no harm but yet if
you go to the hospitals and you go to nursing homes you
see the effects of smoking.

The restaurant people are opposing these regulations, the reason is it's profit. They get more profit from people not smoking there but drinking. I spoke to the woman, oh, I guess 15 years ago now who represented the Restaurant Association and what I told her was I didn't understand why they're opposing it because if people don't smoke they're in and out more quickly. She said smokers sit and drink and there's more profit in alcohol than in food. That's the issue, acknowledged.

I heard the other day on radio that Mr. Sabitini said that the medical cost for treating

smoking related illnesses in this state alone are over 500 million dollars. Now if there's something you can do to help the majority of smokers who want to quit so that our medical costs for the state and our insurance companies go down I think you should do that.

COMMISSIONER KOELLEIN: Mr. Wright, I'm going to try to summarize a little bit. I'm kind of getting anxious to get to that gentleman over there.

MR. WILLIAM WRIGHT: I have one and a half pages, sir. If you should need to consider reading these regulations I would suggest that you first visit the cancer and emphysema wards of our local hospitals and nursing homes. As I said to you outside today I remember you a long time ago being with the Union and I know that you have employee concerns on top of your environment. How many people have you known over the years who were smokers that have died because of smoking tobacco products? If this regulation had been put in place 20 years ago, 25 years ago many of your friends would probably have quit smoking and probably be alive today.

I want to thank you for presenting this 1 opportunity for us, I know you've been through a lot, 3 you've probably heard many of this stuff before, but we're here trying to support you in what you're trying 5 to do and show the State government, the Governor and the Secretary that there are people here who support what you're doing, like what you do and there's a whole bunch of people behind us, our friends that need it and 8 can't be here today. Thank you, sir. COMMISSIONER KOELLEIN: Thank you, sir. 10 Ms. West? 11 MS. CAROLYN WEST: Call on Steve Xintas. 12 Thanks very much for the 13 MR. STEVE XINTAS: opportunity of addressing you this morning. 14 to change that to this evening. My name is Steve 15 Xintas, I own and operate Triangle Tavern, a 16 neighborhood bar on Old Eastern Avenue in Essex. My 17 personal opinion from what I've heard today is the

> FREE STATE REPORTING, INC. Court Reporting Depositions D.C. Area 261-1902 Balt. & Annap. 974-0947

lines were already drawn, people's minds are already

made up and no amount of testimony is going to change

anyone's mind one way or the other. I spoke with a

18

19

20

21

woman outside before this all started and she's in favor of the regulation, and I asked her, just had a little conversation, idle chit-chat, was she pro choice or pro life? And she told me that she was pro choice which has nothing to do with this, but she said you're pro choice, you want me to stay out of your womb but you want to be in my restaurant. That wasn't prepared, I just through I'd throw that in.

The only thing I can say to a non-smoker that feels as though he or she would be able to go anywhere they wanted at any time and choose not to be exposed to someone who smokes, I agree with you to an extent, but when you attempt to force your views on my privately owned business that's where I draw the line. As long as my employees and customers are drinking and smoking legal, and I stress legal products, I will continue to allow them to do so. This is a private property issue. I own and operate a small business in Maryland. The state does not subsidize my business, I receive no grants from the state. I spend money advertising and promoting my business. My customers realize that my

place of business is a smoking environment; all of my employees smoke, a higher percentage of my customers smoke than do not smoke. I personally don't, that is my choice, not government mandated. As long as I am dealing with legal products the State has no right to tell me what I can and cannot do on my own property.

what I can and cannot do. One example that I can give what I can and cannot do. One example that I can give you of intrusion is suppose that I have a real estate office that I run out of my home and my wife is a smoker, when this regulation is adopted it would be a violation for my wife to be able to smoke in our own home because it's her workplace. This is clearly wrong and I for one, and for one person, unelected and unaccountable, should not have that kind of authority to implement a state-wide ban that would destroy the bar business and the tobacco industry in Maryland. You can say all you like about non-smoker's rights to breathe clean air, but if they come to my place of business let them be forewarned, smokers are welcome,

<u>CERTIFICATION</u>

2

3

4

5

1

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript in the matter of:

"Prohibition of smoking in an enclosed workplace"

6 BEFORE: Henry Koellein, Jr., Commissioner

7 DATE: May 3, 1994

8 PLACE: Catonsville, Maryland

9 represents the full and complete proceedings of the 10 aforementioned matter, as reported and reduced to 11 typewriting.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Darbara Lord, Reporter Free State Reporting, Inc.

a. Lynn Lork

A. Lynn Fox, Transcriber Free State Reporting, Inc.